DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 453 191 SP 039 992

AUTHOR	Davis, Danne; Jackson, Janna M.; Pizzi, Jonathan D.
TITLE	The Schooling Transformative Process: How Schooling Shapes Values.
PUB DATE	2000-00-00
NOTE	32p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Moral Values; Preservice Teacher Education; *Social Values; Student Attitudes; *Teacher Influence; Values Clarification

ABSTRACT

This study examined the role of schooling in shaping student values, examining how teachers' cultural, religious, and other personal values influenced their teaching practice and how supervisors and mentors of preservice and inservice teachers needed to help them uncover their individual values and biases. The study involved 12 inservice and former classroom teachers with experience in a variety of settings. Participants completed interviews in which they discussed how their values shaped their teaching. They also brought in lesson plans for analysis. Gradually, the focus of the study moved from examining the extent to which teachers' values informed their practice to how schooling shaped students' individual values. Researchers coded and analyzed the data, which indicated that teachers' values did not always complement the values of the family, community, or school. Teachers saw their students as coming to school with externally influenced values, and saw the school's job as that of transforming those values into shared values of the classroom community and producing individuals with internally derived values. Participants' comments revealed the cyclical nature of the process. They argued that the end product of educated consumers was ideal, and realistically, people will always be influenced by external forces. (Contains 16 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 453 191

The Schooling Transformative Process:

How Schooling Shapes Values

Danné Davis, Janna M. Jackson, & Jonathan D. Pizzi

Spring 2000

Lynch Graduate School of Education

Boston College

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. D. Pizzi

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP039992

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE QUESTION

What is the role of schooling in (re)shaping individual student values? Embedded in our acknowledgement that schools shape values is the assumption that students bring into classrooms individual beliefs and ideas. Additionally, we assume that a myriad of external factors including home, religion and culture serve as the foundation for these individual beliefs. Similarly, teachers have external personal and professional experiences that accompany them into the classrooms. The salient aspect of our inquiry pertains to teacher beliefs and how they play out in the classroom. Specifically we want to know about the design of lessons, their subject content and presentation and how these reflect values.

THE PURPOSE OF THE QUESTION

The development of our research question rests in two realities. First, as classroom practitioners we recognize that our cultural, religious and other personal values are quite evident in our vast years of instructional practice and now we seek to investigate whether they should be. Second, as supervisors and mentors to prospective and in-service practitioners we are mindful of the need to help these teachers uncover their individual values and biases. Many teacher education programs like our own university program embrace the social justice pedagogical program of study. We believe that the opportunity for teachers to examine topics about class, race and sexual orientation will enable them to investigate how their practice specifically shapes instruction and contributes to this valuable conversation.

THE QUESTION DEVELOPMENT AND THE CONNECTION AMONG US

The construction of the question came only after several meetings of lively discourse and banter about our unique assumptions and dilemmas. We were aware of the necessity for our participants to be able to locate themselves within the study. This meant serious consideration of

a topic that would generate the greatest collective interest and engage our participants. The design of the question would have to sustain us as well.

Janna, whose sensibilities about equity and gender are always powerful and prevalent during her discussions, spoke first about her concerns relating to religious values and classrooms.

> I came to this project with my own set of assumptions regarding values in the classroom. As a high school English teacher, I often bumped into ethical considerations regarding controversial topics. I am an ardent believer in the separation of church and state, I have difficulty whenever students couch discriminatory beliefs in terms of religion. I feel that it was not my place to condemn or even comment on someone's religious beliefs, but I also feel like my classroom should be one of tolerance and not hate. Because of my experience in the classroom as well as my own upbringing and political beliefs, I am aware of the contradiction between the expectation that teachers be value neutral and the reality that teachers bring their own set of beliefs to the classroom. A teacher's choices regarding content material – what to emphasize, what to omit, what to assess makes his or her own epistemology transparent. Even if a teacher were able to separate his or her own beliefs from the curriculum of the classroom, a teacher's pedagogy conveys both explicitly and implicitly a set of beliefs regarding learning, student-student interaction, student-teacher interaction, equity, diversity, and a whole range of other areas.
>
> Just as we are hoping our participants to put their values out on the table, I must do the same with mine. I believe that instead of imposing values,

> teachers should teach both the facts, skills, and empathy so students have the tools to develop their own value system because they will need to make informed decisions and moral judgments about future situations that we are unable to presently foresee. My background in the classroom will both enable and limit me from viewing values in education from my participants' perspectives. Only through constant revisiting and examination of my own values and how they might color this study, can I strive toward achieving the emic perspective. Although it is not possible for me to look through our participants' eyes, like an asymptote, I can work towards that end.

Janna's stance was a salient reminder of our university mission of social justice. Although the fervor of her concerns regarding equity, diversity and religion were not as intensely with in each of us, we did agree to attempt to situate our study within a critical paradigm.

The classroom experiences of teachers and children of color were two new suggestions. Danné shared her concerns regarding the instruction of children of color.

> As an African-American teacher with ten years of urban teaching experience, I am aware of the unique circumstances of urban students especially children of color. I feel that I bring to my work certain beliefs about the situations and circumstances of my students because of the commonality of our culture. We live and work in the same school community. This is how I justify my stance. Whether appropriate or not I bring into to my practice my values about academic achievement and personal interpretation of success. However, I am not in every classroom and teachers who share my culture and social ideology do not lead every classroom. I am

> mindful of the tremendous socioeconomic stratification in American classrooms especially within the urban context. The majority of classroom teachers serving in public schools represent White middle class values while conversely the majority of students attending public schools represent an economic and ethnic spectrum (Banks, 1993). I view this disparity as problematic because of the inherent power that personal values and beliefs of teachers can have on shaping curriculum and instruction. I know this from personal experience because I do it! While I feel I can justify my didactic words and actions because of the impact of my experiences in shaping my ideology, I suggest that all teachers, especially those whose experiences are remote and uncommon from those of their student, need to examine the pervasiveness of their value-laden instruction so that they might determine whether their work and positionality detrimentally passes judgment on urban children of color or if their instruction inculcates values that beneficially enlightens and empowers students of color.

This topic idea did not gain favor due to a combination of factors including only one of us being of color and lack of mutual interest.

Gender equity in educational administration was another research idea that did not receive a consensus. Jonathan spoke of his perspective.

> My contribution to this study is a four years of service as a classroom teacher of eleventh grade English. As a teacher my task was to instruct college and career bound students in American literature, English composition, and online and technical research. I also have the experience of an associate school department treasurer for

three of those four. As a quasi-administrator my daily interactions with teachers, who were also advisors and moderators, in consultation regarding the fiscal dimensions of the school clubs, teams, and extracurricular activities. I held both positions in a large urban school district.

I realize that there are several intrinsic personal biases that I hold about teachers and instruction. The first is that in-service teachers harbor a certain prejudice about the interactions, between parents and students in the home. Furthermore, teachers contend that it is their professional obligation to fill this void of communication between parent and student. My second assumption is that in-service and post-service teachers believe, ideally, that the classroom should be a value-free environment. One final assumption is that these same teachers would then proceed, through the behavior they model and their presentations of coursework, to promulgate their own personal values within the classroom.

Jonathan's desire to examine his assumptions through his lens as an administrator, unlike the desires of Danné and Janna, whose lenses were as classroom practitioners.

Although we did not agree upon these particular topics, we were quick to realize that each topic had a connection to our personal values and beliefs. As a result we began to wonder about the awareness other educators, particularly teachers, had of their assumptions and biases that inform their practice. We also became inquisitive about how those assumptions and biases exist in classroom and the extent to which values they shape instruction. Incidentally, this was our original research question.

DATA COLLECTION

Entry

With a commitment to completing our project by the semesters' end, we chose to use a university setting. As graduate assistants with the practicum office, our familiarity with the office gatekeepers gave us almost immediate access and easy entry to the field. This would ultimately allow us to effortlessly identify a combination of twelve in-service and former classroom teacher participants. Their teaching experiences ranged across grades K-12, with teaching experience in urban and suburban settings, parochial and vocational schools, and in the northeast and midwest.

When to begin

The concept of time was a concern for us not from the perspective of natural sampling as Ball (1990), who discusses time with regard to situation within the field and data collection. Rather our concerns about time were more germane to the actual process of performing this qualitative research. We attribute much of our group work success our prior decision of the timely completion of this project. Almost immediately we had a three-way consensus about completing the research by the end of the semester. We made a verbal commitment to maintaining a diligent work ethic. We also would not give any consideration to receiving an incomplete grade. Danné made the suggestion that we construct a back-end schedule. This meant establishing dates from when we hoped to finish our study to our status at the time of planning. The last day of class was May 3rd and two weeks prior Janna and Danné would be at an out of town conference. This time frame would not allow us to schedule twelve individual interviews nor would it permit us to have follow-up interviews for clarification of any previous data. However, the study could be done by the semester's end. In our minds it had to be!

Initial Focus Group

The identification of participants was challenging because of our initial inability to keep distinct our task of a local investigation rather than our socialized tendency toward randomization. Although their experience as teachers would be the common cultural feature, a range of teaching experiences was necessary to ensure a sizable participant pool in anticipation of participant withdrawal (Punch, 1994).

We began to prepare the initial exploratory focus group, to gather ideas about the topic, and to refine questions for the actual individual interviews (Fontana & Frey, 1994). We devised a list of questions beginning with abstract, hypothetical questions regarding teachers and the manifestation of their values in the classroom and then moving to probing for specific, concrete examples from our participants' experiences. We decided, though, to let these questions be guiding questions and instead try to follow our participants' lead.

Each of us had a task. Janna, whose verbal discourse and southern warmth are among her many assets, would sit among the participants and lead the discussion. During the focus group, we followed our participants' line of thought until they strayed too far from the educational realm. When they ventured into social commentary, Janna attempted to direct their focus back to the classroom. Jonathan and Danné would attend to the electronic equipment—two audio recorders and one video recorder. Ramona and Miguel were adamant about not appearing on video so Jonathan made it his responsibility to position the camera away from their images. He and Danné would also record their visual observations, take supplemental notes, and address any other necessary aspects of this phase of data collection to insure for a successful focus group interview.

At the end of the 1 ½ hour meeting there was a mutual exchange of appreciation between our participants and us. Seemingly, this was the point where we became aware of the interest in our study by our participants. Frances shared her thoughts:

> I think that as much as this is for your research paper I think these are the conversations that people should be having. And I think it's real [important]. It has made me think about different things…I think it's a really good conversation.

Commendation also came from another participant, Annabelle. "I think this has been really interesting…It sounds like a great, great project." In addition to these commentaries we now had two 180 minutes tapes requiring transcription, a video tape to view, and the question of what to do next.

The transcription

Janna would spend the following Friday and Saturday manually transcribing the data from the initial focus group. We discovered "Dragon Naturally Speaking," a software program that translates spoken words into written text. Initially we thought the participants could use the software program directly, but we realized that the time to train the program to their voices would be too much and without training, the program made too many mistakes. Through creative ingenuity and determination we were able to modify the program to our benefit. After our three individual interviews, we would listen to the audio recordings of each interview, and restate the dialogue from the audio recording into the computer microphone for Dragon Naturally Speaking. The program would then process the dialogue into text. This was a more efficient use of our time and, except for some minimal changes of correcting "today" to "Danné" and rewriting "um" to "I am" this approach was highly useful.

The individual interviews

Our hope was to meet with six participants within a three-day period. The identification of these particular participants was a result of our individual open-coding procedure from the focus group transcript. Within that document we gave consideration to any relationships among the separate spheres of our actors, their work places and their activities (Rossman & Rallis, 1998). Through this fracturing process (Strauss & Corbin, 1994) it was our intention to locate any recurrent themes or categories that might provide some direction to our original question still in use, "To what extent do teachers bring values into the classroom?" A tacit agreement among us was to use the participants' in vivo open-codes "values" and "beliefs", or any aspects of their interview we thought pertained to these open-codes. Additionally, any participant who was outspoken during the focus group, and exhibited any indication of an association with our personal convictions would receive an invitation to an individual interview. Unfortunately, the time spent discussing who to invite would become moot because of the ensuing Spring Break, employment schedules and course work, would only avail three participants. Since time was progressing we too had to forge ahead.

A semi-structured interview protocol, a combination of scripted questions, closed ended questions and open-ended inquires were in place for each of the three interviews (Fontana & Frey, 1994). This idea came from class discussions and a modification of the structured and unstructured interview approach of Fontana and Frey (1994). "Tell us about what you brought to the interview" was our opening question. We felt that the construction of this question would allow for the social dimension of the interview process and ultimately encourage the participants to locate their own answers and narrate their personal stories of values and classroom instruction without our interruption, or specific direction and prodding (Mishler, 1986). Initially, this was

difficult for us because the first participant did not bring an artifact to help us in gathering data, however our subsequent participants did bring lesson plans to share, ultimately permitting us to experience interviewing as a complex behavior without imposing any apriori categorization (Fontana & Frey, 1994).

Further triangulation – Artifact and Observation Analysis

We began our analysis of the lesson plans with some uncertainty. During one of our Monday meetings the three of us spent time trying to determine whether there existed any disparities in the use of the instructional materials. Initially, consideration was given to the commercial production aspect of the materials. What could we determine about the values of the participant from the reading the table of contents, the subject and content area of the material? Furthermore, could we discover anything about the participant's belief structure from their decision to use commercial instructional materials instead of making materials themselves. Would it be too great an inference to analyze the adaptations for use by the participants? The resolution to this dilemma was to complete the axial coding process of the actual materials themselves. Any other findings would be highly inferential without having the participant available to answer our ancillary questions.

Kirsten was a participant who did not attend the initial focus group but gave us a video recording of her classroom instruction. We were greatly appreciative to have access to this artifact because it gave insight into the practice of a teacher in an affluent public, suburban, fourth-grade classroom. We made the decision to approach the seventy- minute video like a field observation. Individually we made raw or rough notes of the observable behavior between the students and between the students and teacher. We also took rough notes of any discernable audibles. After approximately thirty minutes the phenomenon of instrument decay became a

reality so we stopped the video and began to expand our notes to the intermediate stage. However, it would not be until our next group meeting that we would collectively elaborate upon our observation of Kirsten's instruction, construct a transcript and begin to open code this data.

THEORY BUILDING

After collecting and transcribing the data, we started to code the data. Unfortunately, at that point we did not have HyperResearch so we each devised our own method of coding ranging from using a number system, to multi-colored highlighters, to changing the color of the text in the word processing document. Obtaining HyperResearch allowed us to come together and code as a group. This was tremendously helpful because then we developed common language and common understandings of our codes whereas before we were really working independently of each other. It also mired and situated us in the data, giving us a familiarity that we otherwise would not have gained (Rossman & Rallis, 1998). Coding forced us to work our way through all the data, preventing us from falling into the trap of having a theory in the back of our mind and looking only at that data supporting a pre-determined theory.

After open-coding, we used HyperResearch to create a report which organized the data by code. We used this report to do our axial coding. In doing the axial coding, we further defined and distinguished the different codes (see *Samples of Axial Coding*). Having the report with the actual data helped to ground us in the data. Working with a group was essential as we each reminded each other when we ventured off into our own speculation. We were constantly referring back to the data to make sure our axial coding derived from the participants and not from us. This course gave us the language to do so as we strove to use in vivo terms and as we queried each other as to whether or not our conclusions were low inference.

When we started the axial coding, we ran into a stumbling block over varied definitions of properties, dimensions, and conditions. When it became clear to us that we were not going to come to a consensus, we opted to ask our codes the who, what, when, where, why, and how questions as these would cover all the aspects of properties, dimensions, and conditions. Although this process of interrogating the codes was essential to our progress, our major breakthrough did not take place until selective coding.

We chose "instruction shapes values" as our core code because all but a few irrelevant codes derived from this category. We started out with relative versus universal as one code, but realized that splitting this code would further define our emerging theory. Jonathan recognized that sometimes people discussed a set of universal community codes but that these sets of codes were relative to other community codes. Janna argued that these sets of values could not be universal because they did not transcend time and space. This led to a new category of shared values to encompass these both universal and relative codes. We got caught up in whether or not hypocrisy existed as a separate code or if it was a subcategory of relative values. Janna argued that hypocrisy was an anchor along the continuum with hypocrisy being varied values within an individual, relative being consistent values within an individual but different from other individuals, shared being consistent community values, and universal being values of all. Jonathan argued that hypocrisy was an example of values being relative both individually and situationally. Danné helped move us along by asking if that category addressed the core category of instruction shaping values. As we looked back to the data in that category, we realized none of the data had to do with instruction so the hypocrisy code dropped out.

Once we established these three categories branching off from our core category, we tried to subsume each of our codes under these categories. As we did so, we realized that our code

map was not going to be as simple as we initially thought. We realized that certain codes belonged in between categories. The relationships between the codes and the major categories became essential to our understanding of the data. It was this examination of the relationships among codes that led to our theory. We realized that our participants saw their students as coming to school with relative values and the school's job as transforming these values into shared values of the classroom community and then producing individuals with relative values.

A few pieces were still missing. First of all, we needed to examine more closely this process in school. We realized that certain educational values that came across in our data analysis as codes occurred during the relative to shared phase and others during the shared to relative phase. Specifically, cooperative learning and community building emerged as converting relative values to shared ones and independent/critical thinking development and student ownership of learning as integral to the process of transforming shared values to relative ones. The question that kept on nagging us was what was the purpose of school, then, if the beginning product (relative values) was the same as the end product (relative values). Our final epiphany took place. The difference between the two types of individuals with relative values was that those before undergoing the transformational process of school were subject to their environment and society's influences, while the goal of our teachers was to produce "educational consumers and critical thinkers."

An exception to this model was the value of respecting all. Perhaps this is a function of most of our participants choosing to attend a university with a focus on equity and social justice. This was treated as a universal value by our participants. We modified our model, then, to reflect that the goal for this particular value included developing a universal value of respecting all. Because of the different goal, the process became different as well. In this case, the creation

of a shared classroom community provided a model of how students could carry this value from the classroom to the outside world.

MEMBER CHECK

Because we took a constructivist approach, we wanted to ensure that we, the researchers and our participants, built our understandings together (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). In order to do this, our last focus group served as a member check (Rossman & Rallis, 1998) or participant validation. Four participants, Frances, Helen, Miguel and Kingston, were available. During the meeting we presented our data via a visual aid rather than tell our participants our theory. The structure of this focus group was to solicit feedback and validation from them about our findings and analysis (Fontana & Frey, 1994). We were hopeful that through this technique we might encourage reflection from our participants. To facilitate conversation during the member check we did not articulate our theory that "students came to school with their own individual values and through the inculcation of new values through the schooling process, they would leave school as educated consumers, able to problem solve and think critically." Instead we made a request that they construct and articulate a theory of our findings. The result was similar to the construction of our own theory but with two additional aspects. First, the process of inculcation had to acknowledge the external influences. Our participants insisted that the theory include the values the students brought with them to school. The second dimension was that the process was cyclical. After school new relative values were in place and students would once again return to school as college students or as elementary parents and begin the transformative process of shared values again. Frances even made a modification to the visual representation of our theory. Her idea is the current visual aid of our theory in chart, which raises our final question, What is the role of schooling in shaping individual student values?

This proved to be an essential step to our theory emerging from our participants as they queried us and clarified our findings. Thus providing us with a means to check on our descriptive validity, that we are accurately reflecting the data (Maxwell, 1992). We primarily used the member check for interpretive validity, to ensure that our interpretations are "embedded in the cultural framework of the actors" (Maxwell, 1992, p. 288) giving us an emic perspective. The combination of having multiple researchers, triangulation, and participant validation helped us establish the legitimacy of our codes (construct validity) and the legitimacy of the relationships among our codes (internal or causal validity) leading to theoretical validity (Maxwell, 1992).

As our participants grappled with our findings, new understandings emerged. We revised our model to reflect the cyclical nature of the process. Our participants helped us understand that this cycle has many layers as it takes place on a daily, monthly, yearly, and even a lifelong basis. They argued that our end product, that of "educated consumers," was ideal, and realistically individuals will always be influenced by external forces. In addition, they helped choose more descriptively accurate terms such as schooling, to focus on the process, instead of using the word school, which emphasizes the location. We also changed our end product from relative values to individual values to emphasize the difference between the original relative values on the suggestion of our participants. They discussed developmental issues as well, that these forces change from being the family in elementary school to being peers at the high school level. As these new external factors emerge or as old ones reassert their influence, students may regress, with the cycle having a negative gain instead of a positive one, but that, over time, a positive net gain will hopefully result. The unstated assumption underlying this view was that developing one's own value system is valued greater than values being determined by outside influences.

Our participants added a new depth of complexity, changing our model from an ideal one to a more realistic reflection of our participants' understandings of what takes place in schools. The goal, then, is not to create an individual whose values are one hundred percent derived internally, but to shift the ratio of externally derived values to internally derived ones. We call this the Schooling Transformative Process model.

Our final results confirm that our theory was grounded, that is inductively emerging from the data, because our final question became radically different from our initial one (Strauss & Corbin, 1994) just as David Coe (1991) changed his question when he moved from being a naïve researcher to the neophyte. We went from "To what extent do teacher's values inform their practice?" to "How does schooling shape students' individual values?" This reflects our transformation from being teacher-focused, to being issue-focused, to being student-focused as filtered through our participants' eyes. By working through the whole process and not being tempted by shortcuts, we were able to use triangulation, participant validation, coding, axial coding, selective coding, and constant reminders to each other to use low levels of inference to close the gap between theory and data (Strauss & Corbin, 1994). This credibility, or match between theory and data, helps to establish trustworthiness (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). In addition, the feedback from the participant validation reflects the authenticity of our findings as they reported a greater understanding of their own practice, ontological authenticity, and that of others, educative authenticity (Guba & Lincoln, 1994).

LIMITATIONS OF THIS RESEARCH

Our biggest limitation was time. Because all three researchers and all twelve participants are graduate students with busy lives and because we wanted to complete the research process within the semester time frame, we did not have the chance to do as involved a study as we

would have liked. Given the opportunity, we would have gone into greater depth with our participants. During data analysis, we found ourselves on many occasions wishing we could go back and ask our participants questions such as "what did you mean by this" or "why do you think this is?" More time would have given us the ability to conduct multiple individual interviews to dig deeper into the data. We also would have conducted individual interviews with all of our participants because as mentioned earlier, each one came from a different background with a unique perspective. Additional interviews would give us the opportunity to clarify the data we did collect.

We were limited to what our participants provided us. Because many of our participants moved to Boston from out of state and taught out of state, their instructional material was not readily available. Because our site was in a university setting, this did not allow us to actual field observations. Being in the field would have given us a richer data source. On site classroom observations would allow us to determine if our participants were giving verbosity to cutting edge pedagogy by throwing around educational buzzwords and catch-phrases, or if these were being enacted in the classroom. It would also help give us a more concrete picture of what it looks like to put this process into action in the classroom. Although we were able to triangulate the data based on the additional sources given by our participants, we wish we could have made this triangulation stronger.

IMPLICATIONS OF FINDINGS

Because we chose such an emotionally charged subject of values in the classroom, our findings point to many uses. The most low inference implication is that teachers need the opportunity and encouragement to reflect on their own practice, specifically relating to student value development, both individually and collectively. Our participants indicated the value in

being reflective but acknowledged the difficulty in making time to do so. This greater understanding of the process of value development and the individual teacher's contribution to this process has far reaching consequences. As our data revealed, teacher values do not always complement the values of the family, community, school, or places of worship. An exploration of one's own role in this process helps a teacher to situate oneself in the bigger picture. According to the Schooling Transformative Process model, teachers need to understand the values of the community and the family in order to handle these situations delicately. Our participants' model of the role of school in value development implies that students might look more critically at their family's value system as they develop their own internally derived system of beliefs. Teachers need to examine if this is their goal, and if so, are they prepared for possible consequences.

Instead of taking the end product of creating educated consumers as a positive goal, teachers need to explore each aspect of this model in relation to their own, their school system's, and the community's pedagogical philosophy. Just as our teacher participants want the students to become independent value decision-makers, teachers need to put their own values out on the table to be examined by themselves and by others. Teachers should question this model to determine if it is truly liberating for students, and if so, what specifically is involved in that process.

Samples of Axial Coding

Code	Examples	What	Why	How	Category
Behavior/Thinking modification	"If we could change one kid's thinking that hopefully that one kid will change two kids' thinking and will start changing in the community"	Teacher attempts to change students' thinking and behavior	To carry these change into environments outside the classroom	Modeling constructivist Fostering independent thinking	Relative & Shared
Classroom Structure	"And it was important for me establish kind of procedures in my classroom where all of the children were able to participate at their challenging level."	Establishing implicit and explicit rules and procedures about the physical arrangement, environment, instructional and social interactions	Facilitate learning for all	Teacher guides student establishment of rules, verbal cues determine answering procedures	Shared
Conflict of Values – Teachers and Parents	"If parents had sat in my classroom, I probably would have been fired."	Teacher counters what's taught outside of classroom	Teachers view own values as better for students	Through content, materials, and rules; e.g. 200 condoms	Relative
Conflict of Values – Teachers and school system	"The administrator…was not thrilled by the fact that teachers were taking a voice…and were very different in their thinking."	Teacher actions in school not matching administrator's expectations	Administrator's actions not modeling stated policies and values and stated policies and values of school system not matching teacher values	Teachers takes action individually or collectively inconsistent with administrators; e.g. gay couple at prom	Relative
Cooperative learning	"I think that the children knew that it was important to work cooperatively."	Students have specific jobs in group work	Gives students' ownership of learning	Mix higher and lower ability students within groups	Shared
Critical/Independent Thinking	"I think it's the school's responsibility to teach some things like being an educated consumer and a critical thinker."	Enabling students to think critically on their own	To make students informed decision-makers in real life situations and to enable deeper world understandings	Challenge Question Socratic method Student choice Exploring different angles and possibilities	Relative
Sense of Community	"I think if you have even just a very few, like community rules in the classroom…"	Establish a classroom culture with guidance of the teacher	To create shared values that facilitate learning and instruction	Modeling specific behaviors: Establishing rules, cooperative learning, positive disciplinary reinforcement	Relative
Respect All	"I would say equal respect for all students and learning…"	Showing respect for all human differences	It is a long term, global norm; "It is a given."	Teachers model behavior that illustrates respect for various learning styles, cultural, and human differences	Universal

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

In addition to the enhancements that we would make to this study, further research in this field is necessary. Exploring more concretely the actual process of transforming value development is essential. A long-range study observing teachers in practice in the field would be extremely valuable in making this process more tangible and allow researchers to develop a concrete model for others to examine. Understanding this process from multiple perspectives – those of the students, parents, and administrators in addition to the teachers – would offer greater insight into value development. Studying the interaction among various influences on value development such as the media, family, community, peers, and religious institutions instead of focusing exclusively on school would greatly expand these findings.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

We sought to view our theory in light of similar studies of the presence and effects of teachers' values in the classroom. The studies we examined were qualitative in nature, and we were intrigued to discover that many of the studies' findings mirrored our own. Upon further review, we found that our own theory, that teacher participants view schooling as a process wherein an individual's values are transformed from being externally influenced to being internally derived, could be situated among those of the aforementioned researchers.

In *The Moral Life of Schools,* researchers Jackson, Boostrom, and Hansen reported on their study of dozens of teachers in schools across the nation. They began the study by asking teachers what moral lessons they believed they taught in the classroom. The overwhelming majority of the participants believed that they did not teach moral lessons in their classroom interactions with students. Subsequent to their observations of the practitioners' teaching and disciplining of students in the classroom, the researchers found that indeed, teachers did teach

inherently moral lessons through their daily interactions with students. Jackson, Boostrom, and Hansen theorized that although their participants may have been oblivious to it, subtle moral lessons on honesty, hard work, fairness, and respectful treatment of others (among other lessons), were being subconsciously taught to students in a multitude of teacher-student daily interactions in all of the classrooms studied (Jackson, 1993).

Our study began in much the same way as that outlined in *The Moral Life of Schools,* with our participants initially denying that values do, or even should be a part of classroom instruction. Unlike the participants in the 1993 study, as our study progressed, the participants realized that they did, in fact, teach moral lessons and impart values, many times their own personal values, upon students within schools. In this aspect, our theory advances the discussion on values, for we have shown that when pushed to do so, teachers will recognize the presence and function of values in the classroom. Our participants came to identify a process of individual value transformation; consequently, they believed that they could work actively to impart strong community values, such as respect for all human differences, fairness, etc., within the context of their instruction. We believe this revelation to be a strong and relevant addition to the theory and findings of the Jackson study.

Our theory and findings also bear a strong relationship to those of Catherine Ennis in her study of the value orientations of urban secondary physical education teachers. In her work, Ennis studied lesson plans of the aforementioned teachers, and sought their rationale for the employment of and goals for "social responsibility value orientations" in those plans. Ennis theorized: "teachers' goals for student learning were consistent with an emphasis on social responsibility within the categories of learning to work with others, and understanding [of], respect, and responsibility to others" (Ennis, 1994). This resonates well with our findings and

theory; indeed Ennis' participants recognized, at least in part, that students do undergo an individual value transformation in their schooling, and recognized themselves as instrumental in imparting some social values through their lesson planning. Unlike Ennis' theory, however, our theory reflects our participants' belief that schools had a much larger role in individual student value development which is not limited to the development of social values alone. This may be explained by the scope of Ennis' study, in which she analyzed only the lesson plans of eleven physical education teachers. She examined the plans with the express purpose of determining the teachers' "rationale for a socially focussed curriculum" (Ennis, 1994). As in our study, she triangulated the data with video taped lesson observations and with individual interviews.

We also found our theory to have far-reaching implications when viewed in light of the educational leadership theories of Thomas Sergiovanni. Just as we agree with Jackson, Boostrom, and Hansen, Sergiovanni believes that values do exist in all aspects of schooling. This idea has particular implications for school leadership. For example, he believes it to be the moral duty of school leaders to facilitate the formation of school-wide and district-wide core values (Sergiovanni, 1994b). By this, Sergiovanni does not mean that public schools should espouse to impart religious values upon students. Rather, his ideology reflects that of our participants, that schools should reflect those values that, in his view, would support the members of any given community. Our participants intimated some of these values as, "respect for human differences," "high achievement for all students," and "the belief that all students can and should learn in the classroom." This relates strongly to our theory, for many of our participants stated that the values they imparted in the classroom often came into conflict with those of school administration. Sergiovanni recognizes this, and theorizes that school administrators must begin a dialogue in which *all* members of a school community work

collaboratively and collegially to form three or four core values which would serve as a guide for all school decision and policy-making.

We also recognize that our participants chose the community metaphor, rather than the organizational metaphor to describe schools. This metaphor is quintessential to Sergiovanni's theory, and it is greatly reflected in the central portion of our Schooling Transformative Process model. Sergiovanni believes a community model of schooling to be more conducive to the formation of values and ownership of them by a critical mass of the school. The organizational, or hierarchical model does not allow for independent, professional collegiality and collaboration, nor does it allow for parental and student input into school value formation, at least not to the extent to which the community metaphor does (Sergiovanni, 1994a). As our participants indicated, this would greatly influence the ability of teachers to shape student value development in less arbitrary, and more substantial and consistent ways within a school or community.

We found the concept of the need for professional reflection aimed at improvement as articulated by our participants to be key among many of the theories we encountered. For example, concerning whole school change, one group of researchers indicates that teachers must reflect upon past practice in a coherent way in order to concretize their efforts at reform (Wasley, 1997). As our participants intimated, it is the responsibility, indeed the moral obligation according to Sergiovanni, for administrators to provide time for teacher reflection and to lead reflective professional discussions. According to Wasley's theory, this requires a revisiting of school values, or "mission and vision" in order that these elements may be rethought as student and faculty needs become more or less diverse over time.

In addition, we found other theories that illustrated that without a sense of teacher collaboration regarding school values, a school cannot effectively change in order to meet the

varying needs of its students (Kita, 1998). Kita indicates that if teachers are left to develop and implement programs independently without any formal leadership and when school-wide programmatic change is required by administrative mandate, the proposed change is owned neither by students nor faculty. This directly correlates with our participants' statements that they felt frustrated by principals who attempted to mandate institutional change without consulting them or the faculty in general. Hence, without "community building," as our participants termed the process for creating shared values, the presence of arbitrary values in schooling can serve to be divisive.

This concept is quite prevalent among theories concerning the nation's perceived decrease in the quality of public school instruction and student academic achievement. For example, in a study commissioned by the Ford Foundation's Urban Math Collaborative and the Rockefeller Foundation, researchers found that in many failing urban districts, professional development efforts as mandated by central administration were "fragmented, in need of strategic vision, and rarely clear to teachers" (Bradley, 1995). Participants of the Rockefeller/Ford study agreed with our participants, however, in that they "preferred ongoing activities that allowed them to reflect on new ideas and practice new skills" (Bradley, 1995). This reflects professional development sessions such as the school and district-wide "Cooperative Learning" and "Assertive Discipline" wor' shops as outlined by some of our participants' descriptions of artifacts. This also demonstrates that values shared by a school community augment student achievement as reported in the aforementioned study, as well as by our participants.

In each of the aforementioned works, including our own, there are several strong themes that emerge from the study of teacher values. The first is that the teaching of values does indeed

take place during instruction in its broadest sense. Second, there is a consensus among the studies that in order for instruction to be effective, a basic set of core values must be developed by the greater community as represented within each school and district in order for those values to be owned by students, teachers, parents, and administrators. The third theme, which is explicit in the remarks of our participants and in the theories of Sergiovanni and implied in the other works, is that administrators must lead the discussion on the development of core values, and then facilitate their development by members within school community.

CONCLUSION

School, then, is seen by our participants as a means of addressing values. Our participants see the purpose of school as being to transform individuals whose values are largely subject to external factors to individuals with the ability to be critical consumers of their environment through the process of developing shared values in the classroom community. The one value seen by the participants as universal is respecting everyone. Out of this develops respecting everyone's own set of beliefs in turn leading to the goal of creating independent thinkers. The process of transforming individual values based on external influences to assisting students in developing their own internal set of beliefs involves building a sense of community and with that shared values within the confines of the classroom. Many of the participants stated that a teacher's sphere of influence does not extend beyond the classroom, "it's really hard to control or to enforce or share values when it's outside the four walls of your own classroom." This is similar to the findings by Astor, Meyer, and Behre (1999) that there are certain areas of the school that are "unowned." The interaction between the teacher and his or her students enables students to test new ideas and new values in a safe environment fostering independence. This

allows individuals to establish their own values, instead of taking on those of external influences such as the media, family, and religious institutions.

Because traditional models of teaching do not encourage reflection, specifically relating to values in classroom instruction, teachers are often unaware of how they influence student value development. This research project gave our participants a chance to reflect both individually and through dialogue with their peers on their practice as it relates to values. Many of our participants expressed gratitude for this opportunity as well as remarking on the importance of this work. Collectively, we, the researchers, and our teacher participants came to a new understanding of instructional practice. At the beginning of the research process, the participants asserted that classroom be value free, "I don't believe that morals should be taught in the classroom." By the end of the study, however, they acknowledged that "teaching is a moral act." One of our participants explicitly points out this transformational aspect:

> I've been kind of thinking back to the whole group conversation that we had and I thought it was really interesting that most people started off the conversation by saying values are not taught in the classroom and if you are a good teacher you won't teach values in the classroom. . . and I think it was interesting that by the end of the conversation people had kind of come around to well yeah, on some level we do our own values those of the community and those of the school and of the community do come out in the way that we teach (Frances).

Given the opportunity to reflect on their practice, our teacher participants view schooling as a process whereby an individual's values are transformed from being externally influenced to being internally derived.

It is our hope that this study helps current practitioners and teacher educators recognize the tremendous value in the introspection of practice because of the many individuals such activity benefits. Teachers benefit because it permits them the opportunity to examine the relationship between their practice and the in-school and out of school experiences of their students. Students benefit because their teachers have a greater awareness of their instructional practice and hopefully will design instruction that is gives students the necessary tools for critical and independent thinking.

Perhaps the greatest beneficiary is the community. As a result of the Schooling Transformative Process that takes place in schools, students subsequently become adept solving problems and thinking critically which ultimately enables them to participate in the necessary conversations and activities to alter contrary ecological situations. We hope that the value of our Schooling Transformative Process becomes widely recognizable because of its ability to transfigure the thinking of individuals and ultimately reconstruct the functioning of our society.

References

Ball, S. (1990). Self-doubt and soft data: Social and technical trajectories in ethnographic fieldwork. *Qualitative Studies in Education,* 3(2), 157-171.

Bradley, A. (1995). Urban study faults teacher development programs. *Education Week on the Web.* [Online]. Available: http://www.edweek.org/ew/1995/18prof.h14

Coe, D.E. (1991). Levels of knowing in ethnographic inquiry. *Qualitative Studies in Education,4*(4), 313-331.

Ennis, C. (1994). Urban secondary teachers' value orientations: Social goals for teaching. *Teaching & Teacher Education,10.* 109-120.

Fontana, A. & Frey, J. (1994). Interviewing: The art of science. In Denzin, N.K., & Lincoln, Y.S., (Eds.). *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 361-376). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Guba, E.G., & Lincoln, Y.S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In Denzin, N.K., & Lincoln, Y.S. (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research,* (pp. 105-117) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing Co.

Jackson, P.W., Boostrom, R.E., & Hansen, D.T. (1993). *The moral life of schools.* San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass Publishers.

Kita, S. (1998). Creating a climate for change. *Principal.* 46-48.

Maxwell, J.A. (1992). Understanding validity in qualitative research. *Harvard Education Review, 62.* 279-300.

Mishler, E. (1986). The analysis of interview-narratives. In T.R. Sarbin (Ed.). *Narrative psychology: The stories nature of human conduct.* New York: Praeger.

Punch, M. (1994). Politics and ethics in qualitative research. In Denzin, N.K., & Y. Lincoln, (Eds.). *Handbook of qualitative research* (83-97). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing Co.

Rossman, G. & Rallis, S. (1998). *Learning in the field: An introduction to qualitative research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sergiovanni, T. (1994a). Organizations or communities: Changing the metaphor changes the theory. *Education Administration Quarterly, 30.* 214-226.

Sergiovanni, T. (1994b). The roots of school leadership. *Principal.* (6-9).

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1994). Grounded theory methodology: An overview. In Denzin, N.K., & Lincoln, Y.S. (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research,* (273-285). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing Co.

Wasley, P. (1997). The puzzle of whole school change. *Phi Delta Kappan, 78.* 690-697.